



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,718	03/19/2001	Jay Paul Drummond	D-1120 R2	2928
28995	7590	05/29/2009		
RALPH E. JOCKE walker & jocke LPA 231 SOUTH BROADWAY MEDINA, OH 44256			EXAMINER FELTEN, DANIEL S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3696	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/29/2009 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/811,718
Filing Date: March 19, 2001
Appellant(s): DRUMMOND ET AL.

Ralph E. Jocke
(Reg. No. 31, 029)
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed March 19, 2004 appealing from the Office action
mailed January 13, 2003

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

5,933,816	ZEANAH et al	8-1999
5,221,838	GUTMAN et al	6-1993

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims and 25, 44-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zeanah et al (Hereinafter "Zeanah" US 5,933, 816) in view Gutman et al (US 5,221,838)

Zeanah et al discloses a system for connecting transactions services to an automated transaction machine ("ATM") that includes a network (see Abstract). transaction services are operative to the register with the lookup service and to upload a service proxy to the lookup service. The user interface service is operative to locate transaction services on the network by invoking a remote lookup method on the lookup service (see transaction executor component, col. 14, 11.42 to col. 15, 11. 10).

Zeanah further discloses the fact that the lookup service is operative to return service proxies that match the type of service that is required. The user interface service is further operative to invoke methods of the service proxies that remotely control the functionality of the transaction services on the network. The user interface service is further operative to register

events with the service proxies for notification when certain events on the services occur (see external service provider interface, col. 15, 11. 12-51).

Zeanah et al fails to show a printer service, card reader service, and a cash dispenser service. Gutman discloses a printer for printing checks, a card reader for reading, and a means for making cash transactions. It would have been obvious for an artisan of ordinary skill wallet) into the system of Zeanah (personal computer--18 and/or PDA--20) because an artisan of ordinary skill at the time of the invention of Zeanah would have recognized the convenience in the combination of features provided by the Gutman invention, inasmuch as each of the notoriously old and well known features provided by Gutman would have been sought after in making conventional automated electronic and/or cash transactions. Thus to integrate/substitute the Gutman system into the Zeanah et al would have been an obvious expedient well within the ordinary skill in the art.

(10) Response to Argument

The Appellant asserts on page 11 of the Brief that there is no suggestion of connecting a transaction service in a host automated machine, where the transaction service includes a transaction function device and the host automated transaction machine includes a lookup service. ZEANA et al discloses, a system for connecting transactions services to an automated transaction machine ("ATM") that includes a network (see Abstract), transaction services are operative to the register with the lookup service and to upload a service proxy to the lookup service. The user interface service is operative to locate transaction services on the network by invoking a remote lookup method on the lookup service (see transaction executor component, col. 14, 11.42 to col. 15, 11. 10).

Zeanah further discloses the fact that the lookup service is operative to return service proxies that match the type of service that is required. The user interface service is further operative to invoke methods of the service proxies that remotely control the functionality of the transaction services on the network. The user interface service is further operative to register events with the service proxies for notification when certain events on the services occur (see external service provider interface, col. 15, lines 12-51). In particular, ZEANAH discloses an external service provider interface services set (100) which provides protocol support for interfacing with external service providers. The external service provider interface provides a service proxy (or back door man component that is used as a lookup table inasmuch as the back door man component is routes incoming messages to a *registered* or well-known system component. Or at least it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time ZEANAH would recognize the back door component has providing the functional equivalent of a look-up table as a the back-door component requires a table (or look-up) of registered components to route and/or manage messages as the look up table.

GUTMAN was used as an interface disclosing a printer for printing checks, a card reader for reading, and a means for making cash transactions(see fig. 1) . It is thus maintained that it would have been obvious for an artisan of ordinary skill wallet) into the system of Zeanah (personal computer--18 and/or PDA--20) because an artisan of ordinary skill at the time of the invention of Zeanah would have recognized the convenience in the combination of features provided by the Gutman invention, inasmuch as each of the notoriously old and well known features provided by Gutman would have been sought after in making conventional automated

Art Unit: 3696

electronic and/or cash transactions. Thus to integrate/substitute the Gutman system into the Zeanah et al would have been an obvious expedient well within the ordinary skill in the art.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S Felten/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696

Conferees:

Vincent Millin /vm/
Patent Appeals Specialist
TC 3600

/THOMAS A DIXON/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3696